

*UNEP/FAO/GEF project “Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use for Improved Human Nutrition and Well-being”*

**2<sup>nd</sup> International Steering Committee Meeting**

Rome, Italy 18-21 November 2013



**Minutes of the Meeting**

## Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	3
Introduction.....	4
Day 1.....	4
Opening statements by representatives of Bioversity International, Brazil, FAO and UNEP.....	4
Introduction, Agenda and Objectives.....	5
Conceptual Framework of the Project.....	6
General Global Project Progress .....	8
Country progress reports .....	11
Kenya.....	11
Sri Lanka .....	13
Turkey .....	13
Brazil.....	14
Day 2.....	15
Day 3.....	17
Day 4.....	18
Meeting closure .....	22
Important procedural notes to remember for countries .....	23
Recommendations and next steps .....	23
Opportunities for engagement.....	23
Funding opportunities .....	23
Forums for highlighting the Project.....	24
Annexes .....	25
Guidelines for Budget revisions – Cost overruns .....	25
Capturing Co-Financing, some general guidance .....	25
Project Logframe and Work plan Review Guidelines.....	28
Reporting Guidelines .....	28
Terms of Reference of International Steering Committee (ISC) .....	31

## **2<sup>nd</sup>International Steering Committee Meeting**

**18-21 November, Rome, Italy**

### **Minutes of the Meeting**

#### **Executive Summary**

The ISC meeting and back-to-back trainings constituted a very intense fortnight for the project and a large amount of ground was covered. A number of challenges were addressed and following recent significant changes in country staff personnel and national administrations the project appears to be very much back on track. The ISC meeting focused mainly on the revision of a number of project documents, namely the project workplan, logframe and global/national budgets. The meeting highlighted many opportunities for the project and helped countries appreciate the broad scope this project addresses and the significant amount of work still to be achieved.

In 2014 the four partner countries will be undertaking extensive mapping of biodiversity for food and nutrition in selected pilot sites, which will involve assessing biodiversity at landscape scales and at the level of food components as well as dietary diversity at household level, collecting associated local knowledge and much more. There is a rather substantial amount of work involved in this particular component alone and the countries will require significant capacity-building and backstopping. There is also a large scope of work covering policy and markets. Recent training delivered by Bioversity and FAO was well received by country partners and aided tremendously in the revision of budgets and workplans. Capacity building needs will be identified by countries in the coming months to support the mainstreaming and policy component.

## Introduction

The Second International Steering Committee (ISC) meeting of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) supported project “Mainstreaming biodiversity conservation and sustainable use for Improved Human Nutrition and Well-being” (BFN Project) was organized between 18 and 21 November 2012 at Bioversity HQ in Maccarese, Rome, Italy to review project progress and revise important project management documents.

The four day consultation gathered participants from the four partner countries – Brazil, Kenya, Sri Lanka and Turkey – as well as the co-implementing and executing agencies: the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and Bioversity International.

Since the meeting focused mainly on adjustments to the project logframe, workplan and budget, it was decided to keep the core group to a minimum. Representatives from the five international partners involved in the project - the World Vegetable Center (AVRDC), Crops for the Future (CFF), the Earth Institute Columbia, the World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF), and the World Food Programme (WFP) – were contacted and agreed to postpone their attendance to the 2014 meeting.

The International Steering Committee meeting was followed by two trainings: one on *Developing markets and value chains for biodiversity for food and nutrition* delivered by Bioversity International and one on *Food Composition and Consumption* delivered by FAO. A full list of participants is provided in **Annex 1**.

## Day 1

### Opening statements by representatives of Bioversity International, Brazil, FAO and UNEP

The meeting was officially opened by the Global Project Coordinator of the BFN Project, Dr. Danny Hunter from Bioversity International, followed by welcoming remarks by Bioversity International and the co-implementing agencies, UNEP and FAO.

Dr. Bruce Cogill, Programme Leader of the Nutrition and Marketing Diversity Programme, welcomed participants to Bioversity headquarters on behalf of Anne Tutwiler, Director General of Bioversity International. He commended the cross-sectoral platform established by the project and hoped it could serve as a model for similar future initiatives. He also thanked participants for travelling far to attend the meeting, demonstrating countries’ commitment and dedication to the project.

On behalf of UNEP, Dr. Marieta Sakalian, Senior Programme Management Officer, thanked high level representatives from the countries for attending the meeting and for their continued support and commitment to the project from preparation to implementation. She welcomed old friends, national project coordinators, sister implementing agencies and new partners to the meeting. Implementation arrangements now in place, she reminded participants of the hard work ahead needed to achieve project objectives.

In her opening remarks, Dr. Janice Albert, Nutrition Officer and Lead Technical Officer of the BFN Project for FAO, stated that it was her first steering committee meeting, having taken over from her predecessor Barbara Burlingame. She affirmed her keen interest in the project stating that she was looking forward to learning about country progress. Dr. Albert also stressed the importance of food systems and highlighted a number of opportunities to promote project results stemming from renewed global interest in the links between Agriculture and Nutrition for food and nutrition security.

Evidence of the links between agricultural biodiversity use and improved dietary diversity are limited, she continued, and project results could feed into a number of international discussions around this topic. As well as the [Second International Conference on Nutrition](#) (ICN2) jointly organized by FAO and the World Health Organization (WHO), countries were in the process of preparing their national Nutrition Strategies and it was suggested that efforts be made, where possible, to highlight and include the BFN project and its outcomes in these high level discussions.

These opening remarks were followed by a round of self-introductions from remaining participants to the meeting.

Dr. Hunter thanked participants again and echoed Dr. Albert's words regarding the many opportunities arising to showcase BFN project results including the 29<sup>th</sup> International Horticulture Congress ([IHC 2014](#)) to be held in Australia in August 2014.

He also stressed that the ISC meeting would be an ideal forum to draw attention to challenges, problems and issues that countries had faced during the first year and hoped that partners would be candid when voicing their concerns. He hoped the following four days could be used to address some of these issues.

### **Introduction, Agenda and Objectives**

Following these opening statements, Dr. Hunter introduced the agenda of the ISC meeting, describing its purpose. Specifically, the Global Project Coordinator pointed out that the aim of the meeting was to:

1. Review progress in Project outputs and activities at the national and global level since the last ISC meeting in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil in April 2012
2. Assess preliminary progress made towards the project's broader objectives and outcomes
3. Review the project's monitoring and evaluation plan and clarify future reporting requirements
4. Review the project logframe, work plan and budgets where needed
5. Identify the main problems, challenges and issues currently facing the project and the remedial actions needed to address these and ensure all project outputs are on track
6. Review and identify project management issues
7. Review and identify project risks and risk management

8. Assist countries draft preliminary work plans and budgets for 2014
9. Review the current status of biodiversity mainstreaming and opportunities for mainstreaming into national and global nutrition, food and livelihood security strategies and programmes

The Agenda was agreed by all and adopted with no changes.

### **Conceptual Framework of the Project**

Dr. Hunter then proceeded to illustrate the project to ISC meeting newcomers, providing an overview of the project's aim, its three main components and related outcomes. He explained that the meeting would be an ideal opportunity for countries to focus on challenges and issues that had arisen during the first year of project implementation. To help countries concentrate on these issues, he informed the meeting that international partners involved in the project had agreed to forego the annual ISC meeting. However, opportunities would be sought during meeting sessions on how to better engage with these partners for technical back-stopping.

Regarding past and future opportunities, he highlighted Camila Oliveira's involvement with the [International Institute for Environment and Development](#) (IIED) as part of her practice phase with the Managing Global Governance Programme (MGG), an initiative of the German Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ), jointly implemented by GIZ and the German Development Institute (DIE) which she has been attending since April 2013. As part of the MGG Programme, Ms. Oliveira was seconded to Bioversity for six weeks which she spent identifying tools for mainstreaming biodiversity conservation in the context of the BFN project. Her practice phase included a short visit to the IIED in the UK, where she learned firsthand about the Institute's efforts to strengthen biodiversity mainstreaming through the National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAP). Dr. Hunter explained that a special session in the meeting would be dedicated to Ms Oliveira's work on this topic.

He mentioned that other opportunities for mainstreaming biodiversity into relevant sectors would be introduced by Marieta Sakalian who recently attended a [workshop](#) on this theme organized by GEF's Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP) in South Africa (1-3 October 2013). The GEF are currently reviewing their mainstreaming strategy and the Project may feed into this process.

As mentioned by Dr. Albert from FAO preparations for the [Second International Conference on Nutrition](#) (ICN2) to be held in Rome, Italy, on 13-15 November 2015 are underway. In preparation for the Conference, governments usually consider revisions and updating of their national nutrition policies and strategies thus providing another useful entry point for mainstreaming biodiversity for food and nutrition into national policy frameworks.

Dr. Hunter added that prospects had also arisen to revive collaboration with the [Cross-cutting initiative on biodiversity for food and nutrition](#) of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). Activities and proposals for action of the *Cross-cutting initiative* correspond almost entirely with the BFN Project's components and expected outputs (Strengthening the Evidence Base, Improving Mainstreaming and Policy Frameworks, Scaling Up and Promotion). Furthermore, the involvement of both FAO and Bioversity in the BFN project



provides opportunities for these organizations to bring the BFN outputs to bear on the *Cross-cutting initiative*, as well as other closely related work they are involved in, such as the work of the Centre for Indigenous Peoples' Nutrition and Environment (CINE) on documenting Indigenous Peoples' food systems for FAO, and the broad range of biodiversity and nutrition related activities which Bioversity is party to within the CGIAR system including the current ecosystem CGIAR Research Program.

Opportunities to showcase collaboration with the *Cross-cutting initiative* have been suggested such as the eighteenth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice ([SBSTTA-18](#)) of the CBD to be held in Montreal, Canada in June 2014 as well as the twelfth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP 12) to the CBD ([COP-12](#)) to be held in Korea in October 2014. An additional idea has been a special issue of the CBD Technical Series focusing on project outcomes.

The Global Project Coordinator then moved to the issue of capacity building and the need for countries to identify training requirements where national capacities are limited. If need be, trainings similar to those following the 2013 ISC meeting could be organized back-to-back with the subsequent ISC or earlier, either on an individual basis in each country or as a group. Countries could then decide whether further trainings would need to be replicated at the country level.

Dr. Hunter also reminded participants that the ISC meeting provided a good opportunity to review and revise the project logframe and workplan to make it more relevant and targeted for countries. He suggested that the Global Project Management Unit (GPMU) and the countries get together on Friday 22 November 2013 to review these documents along with the country budgets.

The ISC would also be an opportunity to revisit reporting requirements and to revise the Project Tracking tools, an important monitoring and evaluation tool used by GEF to monitor the impact of the Project on the GEF target under which it falls (specifically Biodiversity Strategic Objective 2, SP4 and SP5). The objective of the Tracking tools, explained Dr. Sakalian, is to measure progress in achieving the impacts and outcomes established at the portfolio level under the biodiversity focal area. An additional issue mentioned by Dr. Hunter was the need for a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) for the Project. Dr. Hunter then invited the implementing agencies (IAs) to clarify the role of the ISC to all newcomers.

Dr. Sakalian took the floor and explained that the ISC does not have executive role. This is the responsibility of the IAs who have the final word with regards to administrative issues, such as final budget revisions and decisions that reflect project implementation. The role of the ISC is largely to oversee and provide strategic guidance to the project based on national legislation. The ISC also has the extremely important role of assisting countries in the mainstreaming of project results into national policies. The IAs are there to ensure that the project is implemented in accordance with GEF rules, provide guidance and to make sure that project objectives are being achieved in respect of countries' needs. Terms of reference for the ISC can be found in the [Annexes](#) at the end of this document.

Camila Oliveira from Brazil intervened asking if the IAs could provide guidelines for budget revision, since countries would be revising their budgets during the course of the meeting.

Dr. Sakalian commented that flexibility existed to modify and revise budgets but that this would have to be carried out following GEF and implementing agency guidelines, which would be provided in subsequent sessions of the meeting. She also mentioned that budget and workplan revision was a necessary results-based monitoring and evaluation (M&E) tool. The thought was echoed by Ms. Morebotsane who explained that this had been the expectation from countries anyway during the first year.

This said, Dr. Sakalian explained that the next round of reporting (6-monthly progress report due by 31 Jan 2014) would be based on the most current revision of the workplan and logframe if ready and agreed upon by that date. Dr. Sakalian further explained that budget revision is normally carried out on an annual basis, but in case of urgent need this can be done at any time following prior communication and formal agreement with the IAs and the GEF.

Turkey intervened asking whether country budget allocations could be increased. To which Dr. Sakalian replied that the GEF trust fund was established to help countries achieve their obligations under the CBD. Each country decides how much to allocate from their GEF resources to the project, which is what countries have been allocated as their budget. Once this is done and the project is approved GEF budget cannot be increased. However, if additional resources are identified as co-financing then the budget can be increased.

Dr. Ozkan further enquired whether money allocated to activities that were not achieved in the first year could be shifted to other years and whether this could be done at any time. Furthermore he asked whether the project could be extended beyond the five years.

Again Dr. Sakalian confirmed that moving budget allocations across years was possible, provided justification was supplied, but this would all be clarified in later sessions. She also confirmed that, in view of possible unforeseen circumstances in project implementation, the timeframe of GEF projects were normally extended for one year but within the existing budget, i.e. for a no-cost extension.

### **General Global Project Progress**

The meeting moved to assessing General Global Project Progress as reported in the 2013 Project Implementation Review (PIR). Progress for outputs and activities were described and their ratings provided. Further to the review, some debate arose regarding the assessment ratings from the IAs, which were again called upon to clarify their position on this.

Dr. Sakalian explained that the PIR (that covers the period 31 July - 30 June of the previous year) is a monitoring tool to assess the achievement of project objectives and project implementation progress based on completion of the agreed workplan for a given year. The report is based on information provided by countries and the Executing Agency (EA) which is responsible for consolidating the PIR in consultation with the IAs. The IAs are responsible for rating overall performance. A revision of ratings is carried out in consultation between the EA and the IAs.

The UNEP representative proceeded to explain the definition of ratings such that:

#### *Implementation Progress Ratings*



1. Highly Satisfactory (HS): Implementation of all components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be presented as “good practice”.
2. Satisfactory (S): Implementation of most components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only few that are subject to remedial action.
3. Moderately Satisfactory (MS): Implementation of some components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action.
4. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): Implementation of some components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action.
5. Unsatisfactory (U): Implementation of most components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.
6. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): Implementation of none of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.

*Global Environment Objective/Development Objective Ratings*

1. Highly Satisfactory (HS): Project is expected to achieve or exceed all its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”.
2. Satisfactory (S): Project is expected to achieve most of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings.
3. Moderately Satisfactory (MS): Project is expected to achieve most of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve some of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits.
4. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): Project is expected to achieve of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only some of its major global environmental objectives.
5. Unsatisfactory (U): Project is expected not to achieve most of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits.

6. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, any of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits.

Dr. Sakalian indicated that often during the first year of project implementation ratings given are MS. Based on the ratings and where needed, remedial actions are taken to solve any challenges.

Ms. Morebotsane added that this is the only report that is submitted to GEF annually. An annual portfolio monitoring review is then presented to the GEF Council who can request more information on specific project if the rate is deemed unsatisfactory. Dr. Sakalian further clarified that each agency (UNEP and FAO) prepares annual portfolio reports which are sent to the GEF Council. These are shared with national GEF focal points who sit in on the GEF council. Information is shared publicly and projects can thus become best or bad practices depending on the ratings. Furthermore, she explained, ratings are necessary to better identify problems as they arise and an ideal tool to put in place remedial actions to overcome constraints early on in project implementation.

When questions were raised by countries regarding the very conservative ratings assigned to the project in the first year of implementation, particularly given the late disbursement of funds from FAO and the delays in setting up the National Steering Committees, Dr. Albert intervened explaining that the judgment was there for all concerned, including for the IAs. She indicated that ratings should be viewed in a constructive manner and that everyone, including the IAs could learn from this evaluation, stating that goals for the first year may have been too ambitious for the set timeframe.

Ms. Morebotsane added that, contrarily to UNEP<sup>1</sup>, in FAO GEF ratings can only be based on what has been implemented. If an activity has not started then it is not rated. The issue of ratings was to be further discussed between the IAs for streamlining.

With regards to single activities in the workplan, debate arose regarding the need to keep Activity 1.1.2. (i.e. *Develop working and collaborative arrangements, along the lines of Community Biocultural Protocols, between stakeholders and communities in targeted ecosystems to establish standards for engaging with communities which set out their customary values, rights and rules and which regulate benefit sharing*). Brazil intervened mentioning that it in the First ISC it had been mentioned that not all countries were obliged to carry out all activities.

For this reason, Dr. Sakalian highlighted the need for each country to develop their own workplan, which will indicate whether countries are engaging or not in an activity. She specified that if one country does not participate in an activity this will not impact overall PIR rating, but that any changes should be captured in both revised national and global workplans.

Dr. Bastos from Brazil intervened stating that several national project partners are independently developing some of these activities that fall within the scope of the BFN project. She also enquired about the level of detail required when reporting.

---

<sup>1</sup> Under Section 3.2 Project Implementation progress of PIR in case an activity is not scheduled to be initiated during the reporting period UNEP's practice is to give "S" rating

Ms. Morebotsane replied that reporting is based on country workplans and that complementary activities being undertaken by national partners that contribute to project outcomes should be reported.

There was a suggestion to reduce or split the number of activities within each output to make them more manageable, realistic and more easy to track and monitor. This was agreed on by FAO, provided countries were clear as to what was expected under each activity. UNEP also agreed that the breakdown might facilitate self-assessment and Dr. Hunter reminded participants that, if needed, activities could be revised, reduced, changed and deleted.

Dr. Albert also said there was a need to revise deadlines for many of the activities, underlining that the trainings following the ISC would provide clearer needs and deadline assessment.

Dr. Sakalian suggested the need to revise the deadline of the Terminal Evaluation exercise, which occurs after project completion and which is carried out by the UNEP and FAO technical evaluation offices.

### **Country progress reports**

For the ISC meeting, countries were asked to prepare presentations focusing on the progress against project activities and achievement of targets/indicators to date. They were also invited to highlight the main constraints, challenges, issues, facing project implementation in countries and what strategies or remedial action were considered necessary to address them.

#### **Kenya**

Dr. Victor Wasike was the first to present. He reported on country nutritional status, stating that one in five children is either stunted or malnourished. He then honed into the situation in the pilot site in Busia, Western Kenya, which was chosen due to its high poverty level (66%) and poor diet quality, despite its potential for agricultural production. Child mortality in the area is also the third highest in the country.

Further criteria for site selection included the existence of an active community-based organization, SINGI, consisting of 25 different groups involved in different value chains (indigenous vegetables, poultry) and soil conservation. This would greatly assist in scaling-up project activities and promoting awareness of BFN. He highlighted, in fact, that from preliminary surveys carried out in the pilot site the lack of use of biodiversity for food and nutrition (BFN) was largely linked to lack of awareness of its nutritional value.

In terms of national plans for 2014, Dr. Wasike reported that precedence would be given to the analysis of nutritional value of select horticultural crops, which were prioritized using the Agricultural Product Value Chain (APVC) priority setting<sup>2</sup> and their contribution scored against Agricultural GDP.

The National Project Coordinator also highlighted current constraints in project implementation, mostly linked to resource mobilization. He explained that given the

---

<sup>2</sup> [http://www.kari.org/docs/vegetable\\_stakeholder.pdf](http://www.kari.org/docs/vegetable_stakeholder.pdf)

available budget it had been a hard task to generate genuine interest in cooperation from national partners.

Among other problems for the project in Kenya he listed *high staff turnover* within the Ministries involved. To overcome the issue and ensure continuity, KARI resolved to writing a letter to Ministries asking them to officially appoint a member of staff to the BFN project throughout its duration. KARI also engaged partner organizations in frequent personal meetings.

A further limit had been the *devolution of government functions* to Counties, particularly in the Agriculture and Health sectors. For this reason, KARI HQ has engaged their regional counterpart, KARI-Kakamega, in project activities. The NPMU has also engaged with County representatives of the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries (MoALF) who have been invited to take part in the project steering committee along with local NGOs.

Further issues identified that could hinder completion of activities were *double duties* for staff members assigned to the project. This again was overcome by requesting official letters of appointment from the administrations, accompanied by capacity building for teams to deliver outputs. Last but not least was the issue of *budget limitations*. Dr. Wasike asked for assistance in proposal writing to obtain complementary budgets and recognized the need to leverage on existing projects and ongoing programmes established by the project's international partners.

Following the presentation, Dr. Albert enquired whether the project in Kenya was targeting the same communities that were reported as suffering from stunting. Dr. Wasike replied that this was indeed the case. Linked to this and regarding the issue of funding opportunities, Dr. Albert wondered whether nutrition proposals, besides biodiversity conservation proposals, were also being targeted. It was suggested that, while in Rome, Dr. Wasike meet with colleagues from the FAO Nutrition Division to see what opportunities might exist, such as the [Technical Cooperation Programme](#) (TCP), or donor funded work focusing on the prevention of stunting.

Several opportunities to engage with Brazil were suggested such as the [Agricultural Innovation Marketplace](#), a partnership between African countries and Brazil to enhance agricultural innovation and development for which preliminary contacts had been established with the Brazilian Enterprise for Agricultural Research (EMBRAPA), and the Purchase for Africa from Africans ([PAA Africa](#)), which was recently launched. Ms. Oliveira suggested that opportunities could be sought for the inclusion of Kenya in this scheme.

Ms. Morebotsane congratulated the speaker and acknowledged the fact that much had been achieved in Kenya despite the under-reporting. When asked to assess project progress rating, the NPC reported it as satisfactory in terms of best practices. Remaining activities were considered moderately satisfactory, particularly the mainstreaming component, due to the difficulties in developing the necessary tools and successfully engaging Ministries.

However, the NPC reported that revision of the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) to include BFN was considered as an entry point for the mainstreaming exercise and that the person responsible for the revision had recently been included in the National Steering Committee (NSC). He added that the Kenya NBSAP had been used as a

template in the *Regional Workshop on the Inter-Linkages between Human Health and Biodiversity in Africa* held in Maputo, Mozambique on 2-5 April 2013. The aims of the workshop, organized by the World Health Organization and the CBD, were to discuss mainstreaming of biodiversity into the public health sector and strengthen national capacities on biodiversity and human health inter-linkages. On this issue, Dr. Sakalian offered to enquire with colleagues in Nairobi about status of Kenya NBSAPs and person involved.

Opportunities to benefit from capacity building programs were highlighted by Dr. Burak, senior representative to the ISC for Turkey, who mentioned the [Turkish Cooperation and Coordination Agency](#) (TIKA) with offices in Nairobi. Once in Turkey, Dr. Burak offered to enquire about possibilities for the Kenya team to benefit from the program.

### Sri Lanka

The next presentation from Sri Lanka reported that similar challenges were being faced with regards to rapid staff turnover, lack of Government support and lack of continuity. In addition, road works were delaying access to one of the project sites. Dr. Wijesekara explained that the team was looking for an alternative site, with a number of locations already identified.

With regards to opportunities for the project, the NPC drew attention to the launch of a new homegarden program by the Ministry of Economic Development. He also mentioned the opportunity for the project to link to local food centres set up by the Department of Agriculture who would be interested and could be involved in developing recipes using local agrobiodiversity.

Regarding the lack of Government support, Dr. Sakalian offered to look into this in her forthcoming trip to Sri Lanka where she could raise the issue and seek further support. With regards to finding a new project site at this stage of the project, she suggested drawing up a pros and cons list as soon as possible to decide whether to find a new site or to drop the existing one.

When asked how much of the local agrobiodiversity was going to be marketed and how much would be used for home consumption, Dr. Wijesekara replied that the project in Sri Lanka will focus on strengthening and improving home garden production of local agrobiodiversity both for home consumption and for markets. He informed the audience that a number of food outlets that sell organic products within the city of Peradeniya had been approached to be part of the marketing strategy for the project.

With regards to the revision of the NBSAPs, Ms. Abeykoon, senior representative for Sri Lanka, informed participants that revision is on-going but that important agricultural biodiversity has already been included as an important component for food security.

### Turkey

The presentation from Turkey started by highlighting a number of initiatives that could be engaged to support the BFN project. He reported that in Turkey's current NBSAP, four components promoted the conservation of agricultural biodiversity. The Plan encourages research activities targeting the identification of biological diversity and resources and associated traditional knowledge having a value for nutrition, food security and safety, as

well as agricultural production. Gender issues were also being addressed and partnerships were being established to tackle this issue with NGOs.

Regarding promotion of results within pilot sites, Dr. Ozkan explained that many ministries have extension services in the pilot sites and will be engaged accordingly. He added that the project will also make use of public ads that can be broadcasted for free on national television.

With regards to challenges faced by the project, Dr. Ozkan only highlighted the need for a budget revision in order to deliver on food composition activities planned for 2014.

When asked whether the involvement of communities in pilot sites had been an easy task, Dr. Ozkan replied that this had presented no major challenge. The greatest hurdle was to promote identified species in urban areas.

Kenya then enquired about the large number of stakeholders involved in Turkey and how budget issues were managed. The NPC for Turkey explained that most of the stakeholders were involved as co-financers and thus were not directly funded by the project. Terms of reference had been signed with these partners detailing the scope of activities for which they were responsible.

## Brazil

As well as presenting project progress, the aim of the last presentation from Brazil was to seek clarification from the IAs on the issue of co-financing. The NPC, Dr. Bastos, started by explaining that species identified for the project were chosen based on their inclusion in other policies dealing with food and nutrition security. She underlined how the project had already contributed to the integration of BFN into many strategies and programs dealing with nutrition and food security thanks to the well-established cross-sectoral policy platform existing in Brazil.

She proceeded to explain that there are five policies that directly support the project. Some of these are old but have been modified to fit into the Zero Hunger strategy. All these policies are aligned with activities in Component 2 and 3 of the BFN project. Furthermore, the multi-annual budget for Brazil has just awarded these policies a much higher budget. Considering that these policies would have been implemented regardless of the BFN Project, Dr. Bastos raised the question as to whether the activities that fall within these programmes are to be considered as co-financing.

She highlighted that the Food Procurement Programme (PAA)<sup>3</sup> and the National School Meals Programme (PNAE) as being very big institutional markets for agrobiodiversity products. Further, the National Policy on Food and Nutrition (PNAN) ensures that organic products are paid 30% more than conventional foods, whereas PNAE has a very strong educational component that promotes school gardens as well as traditional foods and food culture and hires nutritionists to serve in every school enrolled in the network. Together these policies represent a huge market for smallholder agriculture. Regional products are underutilized and currently account for only 5% of national food consumption. There is a need to raise awareness of these products.

---

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.ipc-undp.org/pub/IPCWorkingPaper64.pdf>



In answer to Dr. Bastos' question regarding co-financing, Dr. Sakalian explained that the business as usual scenario is what GEF refers to as "baseline". She confirmed that all the policies described in the presentation were to be considered as "baseline" and as such will continue to exist after project closure. However, part of the baseline that directly contributes to specific project activities could also be considered as co-financing. In GEF terminology, the project activities would be considered the "increment" that together with the baseline leads to the "alternative", that is the result of GEF intervention. In other words, the project is adding the biodiversity conservation value to existing projects and programmes. Co-financing is thus defined as the measure of how existing policies are contributing to the defined activities. In other words, only those actions that directly contribute to project results can be considered as co-financing. This however can only be an approximation given there is no real cash flow. In addition, if partners are specifically financing project activities this should also be considered as co-financing. Funding from additional donors than those originally identified at project outset is to be considered as "leveraged".

Countries also enquired about the possibility of modifying co-financing budgets, to which Dr. Sakalian replied that for small amounts co-financing commitments can be amended, however, if decreased co-finance affects the delivery of project results then the project can be suspended, because the GEF will only commit if matching funds are found from countries.

Questions were also raised regarding the division of UNEP/FAO activities in the workplan and how these impacted on budget separation for the two agencies. Dr. Sakalian conceded that this was a very artificial division, and that for the purpose of project implementation these activities should be integrated. She further explained that budgets were kept separate because of different reporting requirements.

She further clarified the use of GEF funds, which can only be used to cover field work by postgraduate student to generate data for the project. GEF project funds cannot be used to establish MSc programmes, or university fees. Data generated through the use of these funds belongs to the project and should be shared.

## Day 2

Most of Day 2 was taken up by the Project's workplan revision. Dr. Hunter explained that the ISC had the flexibility to recommend significant revisions to the workplan at the activity level. Activities could be removed, amended or new activities added. Outputs, to which the budget is linked, should remain unvaried, although wording for these could be slightly revised.

The ISC then proceeded to revise the workplan, which will be made available following consultations with all ISC members.

During revision, concerns were raised by Dr. Albert regarding *Output 3.2* particularly the need for countries to explore ways of meeting increased market demand for local agrobiodiversity through sustainable production to avoid over-harvesting.

Turkey replied that efforts would be made to domesticate or semi-domesticate wild species as well as to secure species through *ex situ* conservation and training of local communities on sustainable use and production. Dr. Ozkan added that plans were underway for the

construction of a botanical garden in Ankara where BFN species could be showcased for raising awareness.

Similar measures were being taken by Kenya which plans on linking farmers from the CBOs to markets. Here again, links have been established with the National Genebank of Kenya for *ex situ* conservation efforts and with the World Vegetable Centre – AVRDC in Tanzania for the supply of good quality seed. Furthermore, many of the horticultural crops being targeted are already conserved within KARI and one of the ideas is to create community botanical gardens which can serve the multi-purpose of conservation, awareness raising and the production of planting material. Under this scheme champion farmers would be trained to produce seeds for the surrounding area. Equally a number of projects are already in place for the breeding of indigenous chicken, such as KARI Naivasha.

According to Dr. Lusike, senior representative for Kenya, the biggest issue is policy and on winning over policy-makers. She reported that plans were being made to engage with the *Emerging Crops Policy* to be signed/published in 2014. Furthermore, added Dr. Wasike, the fact that the Health, Agriculture and Nutrition sectors have been decentralised at the county level presents an added opportunity for the project to be most effective in Busia.

These efforts were commended by FAO who mentioned further resources on setting up and running school gardens on the dedicated [FAO website](#). Dr. Hunter also pointed out that the whole area of Community Biodiversity Management was a very hot topic.

Sri Lanka's focus, explained Dr. Wijesakara, was wild species and rare and threatened species, especially root and tuber crops as well as local rice varieties selected by the Department of Agriculture. For seed supply links had been established with National Genebanks whereas for roots and tubers planting material would come from NGOs that are involved in the project.

With regards to Brazil, Dr. Bastos explained in her presentation that smallholder farmers require certification to be part of the National Plan for the Promotion of Socio-Biodiversity Product Chains (PNPSB) that deals with finding markets for products. The Programme covers all marketing aspects from field production to identifying niche markets for specific agrobiodiversity products. She reported that plans were underway for the nutritional characterization of the identified species while all issues of sustainable production were being addressed by the programmes involved. Species selected by Brazil are already included in the PNPSB programme and in the *Plants for the Future Initiative*.

The Global Project Coordinator thanked countries for their informative presentations. He appreciated that much had been achieved over the last year yet felt that there was considerable under-reporting. Returning to the issue of progress reports, he again stressed the need for countries to report with a greater level of detail.

Dr Albert suggested the creation of a dedicated online repository where countries could upload information as it became available. FAO and Bioversity would enquire what tools might be available to share and exchange information among the projects. Dr. Sakalian brought to the attention of participants a similar platform set up by the Tropical Fruit Trees project.

### Day 3

Day 3 of the Meeting was devoted to logframe revision following guidelines provided by the IAs. Indicators at Objective and Outcome level were scrutinized for inconsistencies and recommendations made as to how they could be better formulated. The issue of co-financing was also revisited.

#### *Logframe revision*

Indications were provided with regards to Objective and Outcome level indicators, which can have the same wording. Suggestions were made to streamline the Outcome level indicators to fit much better with the Objective level indicators and to reduce and tighten the linkages between the three different levels and targets.

Dr. Sakalian mentioned that, if deemed necessary, countries could omit the output level indicators from the PIR report, since these were mostly used for internal project monitoring. The UNEP representative also suggested that an extra level be added in the six-monthly progress report to include progress towards mid-term and end of project targets. She considered this would help assess project progress even further aiding project implementation.

With regards to indicators under Component 2 (*Policy and regulatory frameworks*) considerations were made on the ability of the project to influence regulatory frameworks.

Brazil was adamant that this could be achieved by the project given the pre-existing cross-sectoral policy platform. Turkey was a little less sure, because of complications at the Government level in getting laws approved. Circulars from the Ministries, stated Dr. Ozkan, could support programmes (i.e. school meals) but could be subsequently changed if not upheld by law. Turkey's concern was echoed by Dr. Wasike from Kenya who was hesitant about the project's ability to deliver on this component. Dr. Lusike, however, was more optimistic and mentioned the need to meet with ASCO once back in Kenya, to determine whether further support could be leveraged to deliver on project outcomes.

Dr. Sakalian's advice for Kenya concerned the need for the national Project Management Unit (NPMU) to prioritize activities given the limited resources available. However she recommended maintaining the indicators and logframe unvaried until the Mid-term review when, if needed, they could be revised.

Participants were asked how they would like to proceed regarding the revision of the workplan, logframe and budgets given that countries would be together for the coming 10 days.

The afternoon was devoted to unresolved project management issues such as co-financing and budget revisions.

Dr. Bastos reiterated her concerns regarding the committed co-financing from partners. Again she asked whether on-going activities executed by national partners, which would be carried out regardless of the BFN project's existence, could be considered as co-financing. Furthermore, she stated that the NPMU in Brazil intended developing several activities

funded by GEF in collaboration with other partners (Universities, labs) thus building capacity that would extend beyond project completion.

To this Dr. Sakalian replied that any money from other government activities contributing to the GEF project activities could be reported as co-financing.

Suggestions were made by Ms. Morebotsane on ways to track co-financing that was used in another project. Guidelines were also provided to countries by the GPMU.

Examples of cash and in kind contributions were given (for example the use of Ministry vehicles are to be considered in kind, whereas petrol for their use could be reported as in cash co-financing). Similarly, *per diems* for participation of national partners in project meetings could be considered as cash.. In order to keep track of project co-financing, it was suggested that the NPMUs contact national partners on a six-monthly basis to gather relevant information.

Turkey brought up again the question of budgets, asking whether allocations under yearly budgets could be moved between years. The answer from the IAs was affirmative, but attention was drawn to the Procurement Plan which needed to be finalized by countries and approved by the IAs before any equipment could be purchased.

Further on the budget revision: budget lines could be added if needed, provided the project management component did not exceed 10% of the total budget. Another word of caution was offered regarding cash allocation transfers budget line components. Between Project personnel components and Consultants components this would be much easier. Between other components would require a much stronger justification. Regarding protocol, any changes in the budget revision would be sent to Bioversity (as the Executing Agency) who would consolidate and forward to the donors for approval.

Further guidance on co-financing and budget issues are provided in the [Annexes](#) at the end of this document.

## **Day 4**

Discussions on project management issues carried over to Day 4.

Ms. Morebotsane focused her presentation on the reporting requirements from FAO and on the efforts being made by the two IAs to unify reporting templates to minimize reporting burden. She stated that FAO and UNEP were working on a unified template for the six-monthly technical progress report that would be shared with countries in the weeks following the ISC.

She also mentioned that contrarily to UNEP, FAO would require a second project progress report in July, to be submitted at the same time as the unified PIR report for both UNEP and FAO. With regards to financial reports these would have to be kept separate because they two IAs report separately to GEF.

Further guidance on reporting issues are provided in the [Annexes](#) at the end of this document.

She also stressed that in order to obtain cash advances from the FAO portion of GEF funds, countries would need to provide Bioversity with an updated annual workplan and budget. For this reason it was essential that countries develop one as soon as possible in view of LOA for 2014.

With regards to budget revision, it was emphasized that variations could be made between outputs within a Component but **not** between FAO/UNEP outputs since GEF insisted on keeping the agencies separate. To be clear, she further underlined that changes could not be made between Components but **only between outputs within a component**. 20% variations within budget lines could be made within the main budget groups, she continued, and between budget lines in the same group based on activities and annual workplan.

Ms. Morebatsane further stated that, with project implementation well on its way, this was a good opportunity to drastically revise the budget since allocations had been made rather artificially at project inception. It was further clarified that financial reports due by the end of 2013 would be based on the old budget and that financial reports would be based on outputs.

Due to the complexity of reporting, Kenya asked whether country accountants could be trained to provide the information correctly. Dr. Albert further enquired whether there was someone countries could call in case of doubt. On this issue, the GPMU revisited the division of UNEP and FAO components and, as in the past, offered countries every support on issues concerning financial reporting. However, it was recommended that countries keep the FAO and UNEP budgets separate to aid reporting. Excel sheets showing separate budgets for the two agencies in electronic format would be provided to countries before the meeting was over.

Next on the agenda was the issue of Tracking tools, which would also need to be updated and revised, if needed, during the Mid-term evaluation. Dr. Sakalian explained that Tracking tools had been developed by GEFSEC based on GEF strategic objectives. - SP4 and SP5 in the case of the BFN Project. The objective of the tracking tools is to measure progress in achieving the impacts and outcomes established at the portfolio level under the biodiversity focal area. Tracking tools are completed by countries at project inception, reviewed during the Mid-term evaluation and provisions made for revising if needed. Evaluators travelling to the countries verify on ground whether these are being achieved. Based on these tools, GEFSEC is able to report to the GEF Council on the achievement of global objectives.

Dr. Sakalian advised countries to review their Tracking tools to determine whether they were still achievable. According to the GPMU latest consultations with the partners had indicated very minor variations. The UNEP representative then focused on Part IV. *Market transformation* and raised questions with regards to the ability of countries to measure the project's impact on markets. She further advised participants to review and revise the indicators in Tracking tools (line 86) to reflect any changes in the logframe.

With regards to Part V. – *Policy and Regulatory frameworks* – countries were advised that more information could be provided with regards to specific policies and achievements in this area. Importantly she added that, contrarily to the PIR and logframe indicators and ratings, **tracking tools were not a project evaluation tool**. Instead they are used by GEFSEC to monitor the overall BD portfolio performance. However, recommendations were made to link the core logframe indicators and the Tracking tools.



Next on the agenda was the issue of the Mid-term evaluation, which is carried out by independent consultant/s hired by the IAs. Evaluators hired for the purpose would visit countries and collect information on project implementation. For this exercise the consultant/s will report directly to the UNEP and FAO Evaluation Units. The consultant/s will need to be identified and visits to the countries planned in advance, however, there is flexibility to postpone the evaluation until June/July 2015, giving countries time to implement activities. Timing and planning of this exercise should be discussed at the next ISC meeting in 2014.

When questioned on the differences between Mid-term review and Mid-term Evaluation it was stated that the sole difference was in the reporting lines. Whereas in the first the consultant/s would report directly to Dr. Sakalian, the UNEP Task Manager for this project and to the FAO lead technical officer, in the case of Mid-term evaluation they would report directly to the UNEP and FAO Evaluation office. Dr. Sakalian further requested countries to refrain from making changes on the budget lines regarding these evaluations. Funds to cover the evaluation are managed by the IAs and not transferred to countries and Bioversity, but if savings were made, funds would be returned to the project.

The second half of Day 4 was taken up by a session on *Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use into National and Global Strategies, Plans and Programmes*. Ms. Oliveira presented the result of her work under the Managing Global Governance Programme. Following a historical overview of mainstreaming efforts in international arenas, Ms. Oliveira reported about the opportunities for the integration of biodiversity for food and nutrition into conservation and nutrition policies. She then focused on the mainstreaming efforts that had been carried out in Brazil following project inception.

The Project Manager for the BFN Project in Brazil highlighted the opportunity for countries to provide information for the revision of National Biodiversity Strategy and Action plans (NBSAPs) <http://www.cbd.int/nbsaps> as well as to the Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture to revive activities falling under the *Cross-Cutting Initiative on biodiversity for food and nutrition*.

With regards to mainstreaming efforts in Brazil she reported that the BFN project had presented the project to the National Food and Nutrition Security Council CONSEA and had overseen the inclusion of BFN into national consultations regarding the revision of the Aichi targets. Activities to generate evidence for the importance of BFN were also successfully included in the Multi-Year Programme of work for Brazil (Objective 0506) and a consultant was hired to develop the National Action Plan for Biodiversity Conservation.

Advice to partner countries was the engagement of the Ministries of Planning and Finance in project meetings to ensure that mainstreaming is successful as well as the need to identify “low hanging fruits”, i.e. those programs and initiatives that are likely candidates to help in mainstreaming efforts. She also reminded participants that the deadline for the revision of the NBSAPs was close (2015) and that many regional workshops were being held for the revision process. She thus advised colleagues to hurry in identifying those in charge at the national level.

When asked whether the project in Brazil had experienced any resistance with regards to the inclusion of BFN, Ms. Soares replied that this had indeed been the case, particularly from the



Ministry of Agriculture which mostly promotes mainstream commodity crops. However, a branch of the Ministry that deals with organic agriculture was successfully engaged producing positive outcomes such as increased budget for nutritional analysis of BFN species identified by the project.

Kenya agreed on the importance of identifying change agents at the government level. Dr. Wasike informed participants of plans to engage **ASCO** and to use revision of the NBSAP as an opportunity to include the importance of BFN. He further reported that the person responsible for this task in Kenya had already been identified and contacts had been established. Further entry points were the *Food and Nutrition Policy* overseen by the Ministry of Agriculture and opportunities existed with other international agencies working on nutrition in Nairobi.

The senior representative from Kenya, Dr. Lusike, requested guidance from the Project to establish networks and provide documentation. Despite delays due to management change issues, she assured the ISC that work was underway to identify mechanisms for successful mainstreaming of BFN. She hoped to be able to report further success in the 2014 ISC meeting. A suggestion was made to host the 2015 ISC meeting in Kenya.

The Global Project Coordinator thanked Ms. Oliveira for the comprehensive presentation and mentioned the excellent rapport established with the [International Institute for Environment and Development](#) (IIED) as part of Ms. Oliveira's practice phased. He mentioned that opportunities could most likely be sought for IIED to deliver a training on mainstreaming BFN conservation into food security and nutrition strategies. Furthermore, an IIED project called *Smallholder Innovation for Resilience* ([SIFOR](#)) is already actively engaged with the Kenya Forestry Research Institute (KEFRI) and he strongly recommended that all partners look at the material provided by Ms. Oliveira and come up with suggestions for future training.

Furthermore, Dr. Sakalian suggested that if a policy brief were produced as part of Ms. Oliveira's Practice Programme this could be used as a tool for other GEF projects. She mentioned that the current draft of GEF 6 Strategy contains a pilot programme on food security in Africa and new GEF projects can be planned in Kenya that could link to the BFN project. Further she suggested that the mainstreaming theme could be a topic for a side event during the next Conference of the Parties (COP) of the CBD.

In this regard, Dr. Hunter mentioned that discussions were ongoing with David Coates and Oliver Hillel of the CBD who had been requesting that commonalities be discussed between the project and the *Cross-cutting initiative on biodiversity for food and nutrition*. Opportunities for joint collaboration would be the next SBSSTA meeting (June 2014) and CBD COP (6-17 October). The CBD had also suggested collaboration on a special issue of the CBD technical series focusing on case studies on biodiversity for food and nutrition. Dr. Sakalian added that the BFN project could be further highlighted by Braulio Dias, Executive Secretary to the CBD at the forthcoming [Global Forum for Food and Agriculture fair](#) to be held in Berlin on 17 January 2014.

Ms. Oliveira's presentation was very well received by partner countries with Sri Lanka requesting support from Brazil in terms of guidelines and experiences for the revision of their NBSAP. Turkey explained that the Ministries of Agriculture and Forestry were already quite

sensitive to biodiversity issues and was confident that the issue of mainstreaming could be easily achieved.

Dr. Sakalian then informed participants of the outcomes of the recent GEF's Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP) meeting in South Africa presenting their guidelines for effective mainstreaming. She explained to participants that after 2004 STAP developed key definitions for mainstreaming of biodiversity into production sectors based on practical experience from GEF projects. Unfortunately, she continued, no methodology existed to assess the success of mainstreaming projects, which also largely depends on specific country conditions. Proper governance and enabling policy environments are needed to make the mainstreaming a success along with champions. Very rarely is there inter-sectoral collaboration which is a major constraint for the mainstreaming projects. Current project timeframes also make it difficult to assess whether mainstreaming efforts are taken on board beyond project completion and NBSAPs are normally not used to full potential by projects to revise strategies.

Lessons learned by projects are not captured or not effectively communicated, she continued. The document will be ready soon and will be circulated to ISC members, although this is more overarching guidance for GEF. Another interesting outcome of the meeting was that no scientific proof existed that certification leads to increased biodiversity conservation. The best thing is to invest in a basket of options.

### **Meeting closure**

This session ended the ISC meeting. Thus, the Global Project Coordinator thanked all participants for attending and for leaving their very busy schedules to be in Rome. He expressed his gratitude to the implementing agencies for their support and their clarifications. He underlined that continuity was indeed a critical thing and a main challenge for the project, and wished that all those present would be involved for the coming years. He added that recommendations and actions stemming from the meeting would be drafted and circulated among ISC members. He then called on the representatives of the implementing agencies to close the assembly.

Dr. Albert from FAO stated that as a newcomer to the project, she appreciated the opportunity to meet all the participants adding that country presentations made her confident that the Project would achieve good results. She also looked forward to being involved and seeing the project work plans for 2014.

Dr. Sakalian thanked all colleagues, old and new, for taking part in the meeting. She reminded participants that the implementing agencies were there to provide support and could be called upon at all times. She also hopes that important results will be achieved in the coming years.

Brazil and Sri Lanka also expressed their thanks.

The meeting was officially closed by the Global Project Coordinator.

### **Important procedural notes to remember for countries**

- Changes in the project executing arrangements can be made at any point over the five years, but these have to first be rectified and approved during the annual ISC meetings
- The same holds true for amendments in the logframe and budget, which can be changed at any time during the year but need to be approved by the ISC and finally endorsed by GEF
- The workplan can be revised on an annual basis if needed. Workplan revisions should be consolidated and circulated prior to the International Steering Committee (ISC), with countries presenting their rationale for the requested changes. These can then be approved during the ISC.
- The next round of reporting (6-monthly progress report due by 31 Jan 2014) would be based on the most current revision of the workplan and logframe if ready and approved by that time.
- For further information please see the Budget, Workplan and Logframe Review Guidelines in the [Annexes](#).

### **Recommendations and next steps**

- Dr. Sakalian to enquire with colleagues in Nairobi about status of Kenya NBSAPs and person involved.
- Dr. Albert to enquire about ICN2 focal points and report to countries
- TIKa Dr. Burak offered to enquire about possibilities for the Kenya team to benefit from the program.
- Government support to be raised in Sri Lanka by UNEP/GEF
- FAO and Bioversity to enquire what tools might be available to share and exchange information among the projects.
- Extra level to be added in the six-monthly progress report to include progress towards mid-term and end of project targets.

### **Opportunities for engagement**

- [International Institute for Environment and Development](#) (IIED)
- GEF's Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP)
- Cross-cutting initiative on biodiversity for food and nutrition
- [Agricultural Innovation Marketplace](#)
- [PAA Africa](#)

### **Funding opportunities**

- [FAO Technical Cooperation Programme](#) (TCP)

- [Turkish Cooperation and Coordination Agency](#) (TIKA)

## Forums for highlighting the Project

### 2014

- 18<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice ([SBSTTA-18](#)) of the CBD – 23-27 June 2014, Montreal, Canada
- 29<sup>th</sup> International Horticulture Congress ([IHC 2014](#)) – August 2014, Australia
- [Building Healthy Global Food Systems](#) - 8-9 September, 2014 Oxford, UK
- 12<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP 12) to the CBD ([COP-12](#)) – 6-17 October 2014, PyeongChang, Republic of Korea

### 2015

- [Second International Conference on Nutrition](#) (ICN2) - 13-15 November 2015 Rome, Italy

## Calendar of meetings leading up to COP 12 of the CBD for 2014

### JANUARY

*TBD Peru National Business and Biodiversity Workshop*

### FEBRUARY

3-7 New York, Eighth Open Working Group meeting on the Sustainable  
February USA Development Goals (oceans and seas, forests, biodiversity)

*TBD TBD First regional workshop on resource mobilization*

*TBD India South Asia Business and Biodiversity Workshop*

### APRIL

10-11 Quito, Ecuador Second expert level dialogue seminar on resource  
April mobilization

14-15 Brazil Third meeting of the High-level Panel on Resource  
April Assessment

16-17 April Brazil *Second regional workshop on resource mobilization*

### MAY

26-30 May Cancun, 46th GEF Council Meeting and GEF Assembly  
Mexico

### JUNE

16-20 June Montreal, Fifth meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group  
Canada on Review of Implementation of the Convention (WGRI 5)

23-27 June Montreal, Eighteenth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific,  
Canada Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA 18)

*TBD TBD Third regional workshop on resource mobilization*

### JULY

14-17 July Cambridge, Fourth meeting of the High-Level Panel on Resource  
UK Assessment

### OCTOBER

6- 17 Pyeongchang Twelfth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the CBD  
October South Korea (COP 12)

## Annexes

### Guidelines for Budget revisions – Cost overruns

Changes to the budget and between individual budget line items can be made **within** and **between** Components providing UNEP and FAO total budgets remain the same and that Component 4 does not exceed 10% of the total budget.

Cost overruns below 10% for UNEP and below 20% for FAO require NO justification.

Cost overruns greater than **10% for UNEP** and **20% for FAO** will **require full justification and approval from the implementing agencies**.

Please read below for greater detail.

#### UNEP

With regard to cost overruns, the Executing Agency (EA) shall ensure that total expenditures incurred by the EA do not exceed the GEF-approved budget. The EA shall notify UNEP about any expected variations on the project. The EA shall be authorised to make variations **not exceeding 10% on any one line item** of the project budget, **provided that the total allocated for that specific budget component by UNEP is not exceeded**.

Any **variations exceeding 10%** on any one line item that may be necessary for the proper and successful execution of the project shall be subject to prior consultation with and approval by UNEP.

#### FAO

The EA shall be authorised to make variations **not exceeding 20% on any one line item** of the project budget, **provided that the total allocated for that specific budget component by FAO is not exceeded**.

Any **variations exceeding 20%** on any one line item that may be necessary for the proper and successful execution of the project shall be subject to prior consultation with and approval by FAO. In such a case, a revision to the Project Document amending the budget may be issued by FAO, following consultation with GEF as necessary. Otherwise, cost overruns shall be the responsibility of the EA.

### Capturing Co-Financing, some general guidance

#### What constitutes co-financing?

By co-financing we mean ‘additional funds’ that are leveraged in cash/kind from multiple sources.

Co-financing is a key principle underlying Global Environment Facility (GEF) efforts to have a significant positive impact on the global environment. GEF grants are intended to be “incremental”, i.e., adding value in terms of global environmental benefits to national/local investment in environmental projects. Co-finance for GEF projects is important because:

- a) With limited financial resources, increased capacity, and a growing demand for assistance, it is essential for the GEF to mobilise additional resources for the global environment. Co-financing expands the resources available to finance environmental objectives;
- b) Co-financing is an important indicator of the strength of the commitment of the counterparts, beneficiaries and Implementing and Executing Agencies to those projects; and
- c) Co-financing helps ensure the success and local acceptance of those projects by linking them to sustainable development, and thereby maximises and sustains their impacts.

Co-financing can take many forms such as finances, technology, manpower- (skilled, semi-skilled and unskilled), knowledge, information, etc. and which are **essential for meeting the GEF project objectives**.

Typically, these resources are committed as part of the initial financing package (see country co-finance letters), but in some cases part of the co-financing may be mobilized at a later date.

Co-financing can be mobilized at the project level and may be in cash or in kind.

#### **In cash Co-financing in projects:**

- Financial contributions from communities
- Grants from local authorities and governments (District authorities, state government and central government schemes)
- Donations from individuals to the project
- Bank loans to Self Help Groups that are involved in the project
- Savings of the Self Help Groups that are involved in the project

#### **In kind Co-financing in projects:**

Other co-financing contributions consist of government provision of office space, facilities, personnel, and other actions directly supporting the Project both generally and specifically. This will require information about the time spent by staff of partner organisations on project activities, level of technical and administrative support provided, and some estimate of the value of the partners own network of supporting organisations that contributed to the successful of tasks.

Significant in-kind co-financing is contributed to projects directly by individuals either through: participation in meetings; organisation of project activities and networking with other projects and programmes; additional unpaid work required to get the job done; technical backstopping; and provision of specialised knowledge and information, particularly when working with communities in evening consultations and on weekends. As very few organisations or individuals maintain detailed timesheets, verifying such in-kind contributions is difficult.

Elements of such in-kind co-financing include:

- Costs of non project staff time in National Steering Committee meetings



- Costs of non project staff time in expert and community consultations
- Costs of non project staff time in project working groups
- Costs of non project staff involvement in project technical and field activities (e.g. technical staff made available by partners)

Estimating the value of time spent by individuals on project activities is complicated by factors including the seniority or actual salaries of individuals and different economic conditions in the participating countries (i.e. an individual's time in one country may be valued much higher or lower than an individual in a neighbouring country). However, an example of the approach used to value the in-kind co-financing in terms of the time of 50 individuals spent in a 2 day community stakeholder workshop at a regional standard rate of US\$140 is as follows:

$$1 \text{ (workshop)} \times 2 \text{ (days)} \times 50 \text{ (persons)} \times \text{US\$140 (co efficient)/person/day} = \text{US\$14,000}$$

Other examples of in-kind co-financing:

- Community's contribution in terms of labour
- In kind material donations by community and other donors, such as building material, machinery etc.
- In kind intellectual services such as know-how, monitoring, impact assessments etc.
- Space, such as Office space

Examples of co-financing contributions:

- Staff: e.g. - 20 senior scientists and 25 technicians X 12 months/year
- Services: e.g. Lab analysis and experiment, sampling
- Equipment: National surveys and labs
- Other: social benefits, office and office facilities, supporting systems of the institutions;
- Operational costs: Energy and communications for the lab, offices

Related financing: the following financing are excluded from "co-financing":

#### Associated financing

This is finance for other activities that are related to the project or to similar commitments but which is not essential for the project's successful implementation. Associated financing may be reported for information but commitments are not required and the financing is not monitored.

#### Leveraged resources

Leveraged resources are the additional resources – beyond those committed to the project itself – that are mobilized later as a direct result of the project, e.g., for further replication or through programmatic influence. As such, leveraged resources do not form part of the committed financing plan at the outset and so they are not defined as "co-finance." Leverage is nevertheless a very important indicator of GEF's catalytic effect.

Resources that are not committed as part of the essential financing package at the outset but which are mobilized frequently are not included as "co-finance". Such leveraged resources are nevertheless important and will also be tracked.

## Project Logframe and Work plan Review Guidelines

### Project Log frame Revision

#### *Project objective level*

Changes cannot be made at the Objective or Outcome level.

#### *Component level*

Indicators in the project log frame can be reworded/refined provided the over-arching Objectives/Outcomes in the two documents remain unvaried.

Outputs, on the other hand, can be dropped if no longer relevant or too ambitious; however, all changes will require a justification.

It is recommended that log frame wording is changed following the trainings, when countries will have a much clearer idea of what activities are expected.

### Project Work plan Revision

#### *Project objective level*

Changes **cannot** be made at the Objective or Outcome level.

#### *Component level*

Activities and sub-activities in the project work plan **can** be reworded/revised provided the over-arching Objectives/Outcomes in the two documents remain unvaried.

Outputs, on the other hand, can be dropped if no longer relevant or too ambitious; however, all changes will require a justification.

In view of current project progress, deadlines for activities and sub-activities will need to be revised to include more realistic targets.

Countries can develop their own tailor-made work plans and activities that, at the end of the day, will contribute to achievement of the indicators and targets for all outputs.

#### *Annual work plans*

The adoption of the FAO annual work plan template (Annex 6.B of the FAO contract) should be considered. This is divided into 12 months and allows for better tracking of project progress. This was already adopted in most current LOAs with countries.

## Reporting Guidelines

Countries will be required prepare **two** six-monthly technical reports (covering the period Jan-June and July-Dec) to FAO and **one** six-monthly technical report to FAO (July-Dec).

The two implementing agencies will streamline their technical reports and merge into a single document that will be circulated following the ISC.

Countries will also be required to prepare **one** PIR report (covering the period from July-July of the following year).

### Memo

#### Current UNEP reporting requirements

Progress report: Within 1 month of the end of reporting, i.e. on or before 31 January, the Executing Agency (EA) shall submit to UNEP a half-yearly progress report for the period July-Dec using the format appended as Annex 8.

Project implementation review (PIR) report: Within 1 month of the end of the reporting period for the GEF Fiscal year of 30 Jun, i.e. on or before 31 July, the EA shall submit to UNEP its input to the annual PIR report using the format appended as Annex 9. The PIR report shall be accepted as the progress report for the period Jan-June.

Financial report (FR): All financial reporting shall be in US dollars and any exchange differences accounted for within the total GEF-approved US dollar project budget. The financial report shall contain information that forms the basis of periodic financial review and its timely submission is a prerequisite to the continuing funding of the project. Unless the FR is received, UNEP will not act upon requests for advances of funds.

Co-financing report: Within 1 month of the PIR reporting period, i.e. on or before 31 July, the EA shall submit to UNEP an annual co-financing report for the project as at 30 June showing amount of cash and in-kind co-financing realised compared to the amount of co-financing committed to at the time of the project approval in accordance with Appendix 2 of the project document. Co-financing reporting shall be by source using the format appended as Annex 12.

Final report: Within 2 months of project completion or termination of the present Agreement, the EA shall submit to UNEP a final report and a list of outputs detailing the activities taken under the project, lessons learned and any recommendations to improve the efficiency of similar activities in the future.

#### Non-expendable equipment – Yearly

##### **Current FAO reporting requirements:**

The Executing Partner shall submit to FAO semi-annual **Project Progress Reports (PPR)** to be submitted no later than 31 July (report covering January to June), and 31 January (report covering July to December), starting from the signing of this Execution Agreement. The July to December report should accompany the following year's draft Annual Work Plan and Budget (AWP/B) and the January to June report should be accompanied by an updated AWP/B, for review and no-objection (**Annex 6.A**).

The Executing Partner shall submit to FAO any additional inputs requested for the preparation of the annual Project Implementation Review that covers the reporting period 1 July through 30 June.

The Executing Partner shall submit to FAO an updated **Annual Work Plan and associated detailed Budget (AWP/B)** and updated procurement plan, together with the semi-annual PPRs and prior to receiving subsequent payments for the works/services to be performed (**Annex 6.B**)

The Executing Partner shall submit six-monthly to FAO an itemized **“Statement of Expenditures”** (certified by the Chief Accountant or similar officer of the Executing Partner), in a format to be provided by FAO, prior to receiving subsequent payments for the work/services to be performed (**Annex 6C**).

The Executing Partner shall submit to FAO a report on **co-financing (in cash or in kind) which has been mobilized** by the Executing Partner and other participating partners and donors in support of the entire FAO-UNEP-GEF. Project activities, as scheduled in the GEF Project document (**Annex 1**). The report should be submitted on or before 31 July, covering the period July to June, in a format to be provided by FAO (**Annex 6.D**) or a detailed format provided for by the Executing Partner that will allow for the aggregation of the information into the same information as requested in Annex 6.D.

Within two months of the project completion date, or termination of the present Agreement, the Executing Partner shall submit to FAO a final report and a list of outputs detailing the activities taken under the Project, lessons learned and any recommendations to ensure the sustainability of achieved outcomes and to improve the efficiency of similar activities in the future. The main purpose of the final report is to give guidance to Governments on the policy decisions required for the follow-up of the Project, and to provide the donor with information on how the funds were utilized. The terminal report is accordingly a concise account of the **main results, conclusions and recommendations** of the Project, without unnecessary background, narrative or technical details. The target readership consists of persons who are not necessarily technical specialists but who need to understand the policy implications of technical findings. Work is assessed, and recommendations are expressed in terms of their application to the country's economy and technology in the context of its development priorities as well as in practical execution terms.

The Executing Partner will provide final reports on Project finances and activities no later than two months after the end of the Project activities to facilitate Project closure.

### **Terms of Reference of International Steering Committee (ISC)**

An International Steering Committee (ISC) will be established to oversee project implementation. The ISC will comprise representation from: each of the Project Management Units at the national level (National Project Director), Bioversity International (Global Project Coordinator and other relevant staff), representatives from international partners, UNEP and FAO representatives. The Global Project Coordinator will act as Member Secretary to ISC.

The International Steering Committee (ISC) for the project will have overall responsibility for strategies, management procedures and plan of action developed to implement the global UNEP/FAO/GEF supported project Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use for Improved Human Nutrition and Wellbeing. The ISC will hold at least one meeting per year, rotating between participating countries. Phone, fax and e-mail will be used to maintain a high level of communication.

The primary activities of the ISC are to:

- Establish guidelines, methods and criteria for general project supervision;
- Review and advise on implementation of technical project components;
- Review and approve the annual operational or work plans;
- Review and approve annual technical reports;
- Supervise the evaluation, monitoring and reporting aspects of the project;
- Provide policy guidelines to the project;
- Review budget and co-financing status;
- Monitor inputs of international and national partners, ensuring that project obligations are fulfilled in a timely and coordinated fashion;
- In coordination with project Execution and Implementation Agencies conduct annual project implementation reviews.

The Global Project Management Unit will provide secretariat support to all ISC meetings, including recording of minutes and distribution of the minutes at least two weeks in advance of the next meeting to all participants and invited observers.